UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/505,674	02/17/2000	Robert D. Newman	28532/1	7423

7590 02/07/2005

Michael casey, Esq.
Oblon, Spivak, McClelland, Maier & Neustadt
1940 Duke Street
Alexandria, VA 22314

EXAMINER	
NGUYEN, THU HA T	
ART UNIT	**PAPER NUMBER**
2155	

DATE MAILED: 02/07/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/505,674	NEWMAN ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Thu Ha T. Nguyen	2155	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *15 November 2004* .

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-24* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-24* is/are rejected.

7)☒ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

11)☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a)☐ approved b)☐ disapproved by the Examiner.

If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.

12)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

13)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____ .

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

14)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).

a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.

15)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) *11/15/04* .
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: .

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1- 24 are presented for examination.

2. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on November 15, 2004 has been entered.

Response to Arguments

3. Applicant's arguments, see remark filed along with RCE, filed on November 15, 2004, with respect to the rejection(s)of claim(s) 1-24 under USC. 103 (a) as being unpatentable over **Mendez et al.** U.S. Patent No. **5,961,590**, in view of **Brunson et al.** U.S. Patent No. **6,018,762** have been fully considered and are persuasive. Therefore, the rejection has been withdrawn. However, upon further consideration, a new ground(s) of rejection is made in view of **Brunson et al.** US. Patent No. **5,647,002**.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made

to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 1-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a) as being unpatentable over **Mendez et al.,** (hereinafter Mendez) U.S. Patent No. **5,961,590**, in view of **Brunson et al.,** (hereinafter Brunson) U.S. Patent No. **5,647,002**.

6. As to claim 1, **Mendez** teaches the invention substantially as claimed, including a method for synchronizing e-mail messages for a user, comprising:

(A) receiving, at an e-mail control at a local server (figure 8, mail server 850), a plurality of e-mail messages addressed to the user, from an external e-mail server (abstract, figures 8, 13, col. 12 lines 1-19, col. 17 lines 14-35 [*the mail server 850 receives and stores e-mail messages at client e-mails 875 from a global server, addressed to a client 840*]);

(B) storing, by the e-mail control, each e-mail message of the plurality of e-mail messages, in a consolidated e-mail storage at the local server (figures 8, 13, col. 12 lines 1-43, col. 17 lines 1-35 [*the mail server 850 receives and stores e-mail messages at client e-mails 875 from a global server, addressed to a client 840*]);

C) storing, by the e-mail control, a message identifier for each e-mail message, in message identifier storage at the local server (col. 12, lines 44-53 [*each e-mail message stored on the mail server 850 includes a message identifier (i.e., source identifier, a creation date, a received date)*]). Note that when e-mail messages that include message ID are stored in the mail server, it is obvious that in the mail server has to

have message identifier storage to store message ID in order the system can use for synchronization purpose with the global server.

However, **Mendez** teaches deleting e-mail message from mail server (col. 12, line s20-23). However **Mendez** does not specifically teach the feature of (D) determining whether an e-mail message in the consolidated e-mail storage has been deleted from the external e-mail server, and if so, then deleting the e-mail message from the consolidated e-mail storage of the local e-mail server. **Brunson** teaches determining whether an e-mail message in the consolidated e-mail storage has been deleted from the external e-mail server, and if so, then deleting the e-mail message from the consolidated e-mail storage of the local e-mail server (figure 5, blocks 418, 426, 430, and 432, col. 8, lines 1-41 [*determining if messages in e-mail mailbox 21 and 31 of e-mail server 20 and voice-mail server 30 has been deleted, then processor 12 deletes the message's entry from the table 200 that stores in the memory of the synchronizer*]). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the Data Processing art at the time of the invention to combine the teachings of **Mendez and Brunson** to have the feature of determining whether an e-mail message in the consolidated e-mail storage has been deleted from the external e-mail server, then deleting the e-mail message from the consolidated e-mail storage of the local e-mail server because it would have an efficient communication system that enable to exchange, synchronize and unify of e-mail messages between the various messaging system, thus enabling the users to retrieve e-mail messages from a plurality of

messaging systems through one of those messaging system (see Brunson col. 1, lines 7-45).

7. As to claim 2, **Mendez** teaches the invention substantially as claimed, further comprising performing (A), (B), and (C) for at least one next external e-mail server (figures 1, 8, 13). However, **Mendez** does not explicitly teach feature (D). **Brunson** teaches feature (D) for at least one next external e-mail server (figure 5, blocks 418, 426, 430, and 432, col. 8, lines 1-41). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the Data Processing art at the time of the invention to combine the teachings of **Mendez and Brunson** to have feature (D) for at least one next external e-mail server because it would have an efficient communication system that enable to exchange, synchronize and unify of e-mail messages between the various messaging system, thus enabling the users to retrieve e-mail messages from a plurality of messaging systems through one of those messaging system (see Brunson col. 1, lines 7-45).

8. As to claim 3, **Mendez** teaches the invention substantially as claimed, further comprising, responsive to a user command, of providing e-mail messages from the consolidated e-mail storage, to the user (figure 8, col. 12 lines 1-28).

9. As to claim 4, **Mendez** teaches the invention substantially as claimed, wherein the consolidated e-mail storage includes storage for e-mail associated with other users (figures 1, 8).

10. As to claim 5, **Mendez** does not explicitly teach comparing message identifiers in the message identifier storage to message identifiers in e-mail received from the external e-mail server. However, **Brunson** teaches the invention substantially as claimed, wherein determining includes comparing message identifiers in the message identifier storage to message identifiers in e-mail received from the external e-mail server (figure 3, col. 6 lines 52-col. 7, lines 9). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the Data Processing art at the time of the invention to combine the teachings of **Mendez and Brunson** to have the feature of comparing the message identifier because it would provide an efficient communication system that can exchange, synchronize and unify of e-mail messages between the various messaging system based on message identifier, thus enabling the users to retrieve e-mail messages from a plurality of messaging systems through one of those messaging system (see Brunson col. 1, lines 7-45).

11. As to claim 6, **Mendez** teaches the invention substantially as claimed, further comprising the local server connecting to the external e-mail server, as the user (figures 1, 8, 13).

12. As to claim 7, **Mendez** teaches the invention substantially as claimed, further comprising requesting, from the external e-mail server, e-mail messages for the user (figure 13, col. 15 lines 12-37).

13. As to claim 8, **Mendez** does not explicitly teach comparing message identifiers in message identifiers of e-mail on the external e-mail server to message identifiers in the message identifier storage, and if a message identifier for an e-mail in the consolidated storage no longer has a counterpart on the external server then said e-mail is removed from the local server. However, **Brunson** teaches comparing message identifiers in message identifiers of e-mail on the external e-mail server to message identifiers in the message identifier storage, and if a message identifier for an e-mail in the consolidated storage no longer has a counterpart on the external server then said e-mail is removed from the local server (figure 5, blocks 418, 426, 430, and 432, col. 8, lines 1-41 [*determining if messages in e-mail mailbox 21 and 31 of e-mail server 20 and voice-mail server 30 has been deleted by comparing the message IDs stored in mailbox with message Ids in table 200, then processor 12 deletes the message's entry from the table 200 that stores in the memory of the synchronizer*]). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the Data Processing art at the time of the invention to combine the teachings of **Mendez and Brunson** to have the feature of determining whether an e-mail message in the consolidated e-mail storage has been deleted from the external e-mail server, then deleting the e-mail message from the consolidated e-mail storage of the local e-mail server because it would have an efficient

communication system that enable to exchange, synchronize and unify of e-mail messages between the various messaging system based on comparing message identifier, thus enabling the users to retrieve e-mail messages from a plurality of messaging systems through one of those messaging system (see Brunson col. 1, lines 7-45).

14. As to claim 9, **Mendez** does not explicitly teach comparing message identifiers in message identifier storage to message identifiers of e-mail in the consolidated e-mail storage. However, **Brunson** teaches comparing message identifiers in message identifier storage to message identifiers of e-mail in the consolidated e-mail storage (figures 1,2, 4, elements 504, 506, 532, abstract, col. 2 lines 26-col. 3 lines 2, col. 4 lines 10-col. 5 lines 9, col. 5 lines 64-col. 6 lines 20). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the Data Processing art at the time of the invention to combine the teachings of **Mendez and Brunson** to have the same motivation as set forth in claim 1.

15. As to claim 10, **Mendez** teaches the invention substantially as claimed, including a method for synchronizing e-mail messages for a user, comprising:

(A) a local server (figure 8, mail server 850) connecting to an external e-mail server, as the user; and requesting e-mail messages for the user (figures 1, 8, 13, col. 12, lines 1-19, col. 15 lines 12-37);

(B) receiving, at an e-mail control at the local server, a plurality of e-mail messages addressed to the user, from the external e-mail server (abstract, figures 8, 13, col. 12 lines 1-19, col. 17 lines 14-35 [*the mail server 850 receives and stores e-mail messages at client e-mails 875 from a global server, addressed to a client 840*);

(C) storing, by the e-mail control, each e-mail message of the plurality of e-mail messages, in a consolidated e-mail storage at the local server, wherein the consolidated e-mail storage includes storage for e-mail associated with other users (figures 1, 8, 13, col. 12 lines 1-43, col. 17 lines 1-35 [*the mail server 850 receives and stores e-mail messages at client e-mails 875 from a global server, addressed to a client 840*);

D) storing, by the e-mail control, a message identifier for each e-mail message, in message identifier storage at the local server (col. 12, lines 44-53 [*each e-mail message stored on the mail server 850 includes a message identifier (i.e., source identifier, a creation date, a received date)*]). Note that when e-mail messages that include message ID are stored in the mail server, it is obvious that in the mail server has to have message identifier storage to store message ID in order the system can use for synchronization purpose with the global server.

(F) responsive to a user command, providing e-mail messages from the consolidated e-mail storage, to the user (figure 8, col. 12 lines 1-28 [*client 840 requests and downloads e-mail messages from mail server 850 to client downloaded e-mail 865*]); and

(G) wherein (B), (C) and (D) are performed for at least one next external e-mail server (figures 1, 8, 13).

However, **Mendez** does not specifically teach the features of (E) determining whether an e-mail message in the consolidated e-mail storage has been deleted from the external e-mail server, including comparing the message identifiers in the message identifier storage to message identifiers in e-mail received from the external e-mail server; and if so, then deleting the corresponding e-mail message from the consolidated e-mail storage; and performing feature (E) for at least one next external e-mail server. **Brunson** teaches (E) determining whether an e-mail message in the consolidated e-mail storage has been deleted from the external e-mail server, including comparing the message identifiers in the message identifier storage to message identifiers in e-mail received from the external e-mail server; and if so, then deleting the corresponding e-mail message from the consolidated e-mail storage (figure 5, blocks 418, 426, 430, and 432, col. 8, lines 1-41 [*determining if messages in e-mail mailbox 21 and 31 of e-mail server 20 and voice-mail server 30 has been deleted by comparing the message IDs stored in mailbox with message Ids in table 200, then processor 12 deletes the message's entry from the table 200 that stores in the memory of the synchronizer*); and performing feature (E) for at least one next external e-mail server figure 5, blocks 418, 426, 430, and 432, col. 8, lines 1-41). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the Data Processing art at the time of the invention to combine the teachings of **Mendez and Brunson** to have feature (D) for comparing message identifier and for at least one next external e-mail server because it would have an efficient communication

system that enable to exchange, synchronize and unify of e-mail messages between the various messaging system based upon comparing message identifier, thus enabling the users to retrieve e-mail messages from a plurality of messaging systems through one of those messaging system (see Brunson col. 1, lines 7-45).

16. As to claim 11, **Mendez** does not explicitly teach comparing the message identifiers of e-mail on the external e-mail server to the message identifiers in the message identifier storage. However, **Brunson** teaches the invention substantially as claimed, wherein the determining includes comparing the message identifiers of e-mail on the external e-mail server to the message identifiers in the message identifier storage (figure 3, col. 6 lines 52-col. 7, lines 9). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the Data Processing art at the time of the invention to combine the teachings of **Mendez and Brunson** to have the feature of comparing the message identifier because it would provide an efficient communication system that can exchange, synchronize and unify of e-mail messages between the various messaging system based on message identifier, thus enabling the users to retrieve e-mail messages from a plurality of messaging systems through one of those messaging system (see Brunson col. 1, lines 7-45).

17. As to claim 13, **Mendez** teaches the invention substantially as claimed, including a system for synchronizing e-mail messages for a user, comprising:

(A) an e-mail control at a local server, for receiving a plurality of e-mail messages addressed to the user, from an external e-mail server (abstract, figures 8, 13, col. 12 lines 1-19, col. 17 lines 14-35 { *the mail server 850 receives and stores e-mail messages at client e-mails 875 from a global server, addressed to a client 840*]);

(B) consolidated e-mail storage at the local server, accessed by the e-mail control, having each e-mail message of the plurality of e-mail messages (figures 1, 8, 13, col. 12 lines 1-43, col. 17 lines 1-35 [figures 1, 8, 13, col. 12 lines 1-43, col. 17 lines 1-35 [*the mail server 850 receives and stores e-mail messages at client e-mails 875 from a global server, addressed to a client 840*]);

(C) message identifier storage at the local server, accessed by the e-mail control, having a message identifier for each external e-mail message (col. 12, lines 44-53 [*each e-mail message stored on the mail server 850 includes a message identifier (i.e., source identifier, a creation date, a received date)*]). Note that when e-mail messages that include message ID are stored in the mail server, it is obvious that in the mail server has to have message identifier storage to store message ID in order the system can use for synchronization purpose with the global server.

However, **Mendez** does not explicitly teach D) the consolidated e-mail storage having at least two states, including a first state having at least one e-mail message which has been deleted from the external e-mail server; and a second state having no e-mail message which has been deleted from the external e-mail server. **Brunson** teaches feature (D) the consolidated e-mail storage having at least two states, including a first state having at least one e-mail message which has been deleted from the

external e-mail server; and a second state having no e-mail message which has been deleted from the external e-mail server (figure 5, blocks 418, 426, 430, and 432, col. 8, lines 1-41 [*determining if messages in e-mail mailbox 21 and 31 of e-mail server 20 and voice-mail server 30 has been deleted by comparing the message IDs stored in mailbox with message Ids in table 200, then processor 12 deletes the message's entry from the table 200 that stores in the memory of the synchronizer*). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the Data Processing art at the time of the invention to combine the teachings of **Mendez and Brunson** to have feature (D) in the system because it would have an efficient communication system that enable to exchange, synchronize and unify of e-mail messages between the various messaging system based upon comparing message identifier, thus enabling the users to retrieve e-mail messages from a plurality of messaging systems through one of those messaging system (see Brunson col. 1, lines 7-45).

18. As to claim 14, **Mendez** teaches the invention substantially as claimed, wherein there are provided a plurality of external e-mail servers having e-mail messages for the user (figures 1, 8).

19. As to claim 15, **Mendez** teaches the invention substantially as claimed, including a user command for providing e-mail messages from the consolidated e-mail storage, to the user (figure 8, col. 12 lines 1-28).

20. As to claim 16, **Mendez** teaches the invention substantially as claimed, wherein the consolidated e-mail storage includes storage for e-mail associated with other users (figures 1, 8).

21. As to claim 17, **Mendez** does not explicitly teach the state is determined on the basis of compared message identifiers in the message identifier storage to message identifiers in e-mail received from the external e-mail server. However, **Brunson** teaches the invention substantially as claimed, wherein the state is determined includes comparing message identifiers in the message identifier storage to message identifiers in e-mail received from the external e-mail server (figure 3, col. 6 lines 52-col. 7, lines 9). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the Data Processing art at the time of the invention to combine the teachings of **Mendez and Brunson** to have the feature of comparing the message identifier because it would provide an efficient communication system that can exchange, synchronize and unify of e-mail messages between the various messaging system based on message identifier, thus enabling the users to retrieve e-mail messages from a plurality of messaging systems through one of those messaging system (see Brunson col. 1, lines 7-45).

22. As to claim 18, **Mendez** teaches the invention substantially as claimed, wherein the local server is connected to the external e-mail server via a POP3 connection, as the user (figures 1, 8, col. 2, lines 66-13).

23. As to claim 19, **Mendez** teaches the invention substantially as claimed, wherein the e-mail messages that are received from the external e-mail server, are e-mail messages for the user (abstract, figure 8).

24. As to claim 20, **Mendez** does not explicitly the state is determined on the basis of compared message identifiers of e-mail on the external e-mail server to the message identifiers in the message identifier storage. However, **Brunson** teaches the invention substantially as claimed, wherein the state is determined on the basis of compared message identifiers of e-mail on the external e-mail server to the message identifiers in the message identifier storage (figure 3, col. 6 lines 52-col. 7, lines 9). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the Data Processing art at the time of the invention to combine the teachings of **Mendez and Brunson** to have the feature of comparing the message identifier because it would provide an efficient communication system that can exchange, synchronize and unify of e-mail messages between the various messaging system based on message identifier, thus enabling the users to retrieve e-mail messages from a plurality of messaging systems through one of those messaging system (see Brunson col. 1, lines 7-45).

25. As to claim 22, **Mendez** teaches the invention substantially as claimed, including a system for synchronizing e-mail messages for a user, comprising:

(A) an e-mail control at a local server, for receiving a plurality of e-mail messages addressed to the user, from an external e-mail server (abstract, figures 8, 13, col. 12

lines 1-19, col. 17 lines 14-35 { *the mail server 850 receives and stores e-mail messages at client e-mails 875 from a global server, addressed to a client 840*]);

(B) consolidated e-mail storage at the local server, accessed by the e-mail control, having each e-mail message of the plurality of e-mail messages (abstract, figures 8, 13, col. 12 lines 1-19, col. 17 lines 14-35 [*the mail server 850 receives and stores e-mail messages at client e-mails 875 from a global server, addressed to a client 840*]);

message identifier storage at the local server, accessed by the e-mail control, to store a message identifier for each external e-mail message (col. 12, lines 44-53 [*each e-mail message stored on the mail server 850 includes a message identifier (i.e., source identifier, a creation date, a received date)*]). Note that when e-mail messages that include message ID are stored in the mail server, it is obvious that in the mail server has to have message identifier storage to store message ID in order the system can use for synchronization purpose with the global server.

(E) wherein there are provided a plurality of external e-mail servers having e-mail messages for the user (figures 7, 8, 13);

(F) a user command for providing e-mail messages from the consolidated e-mail storage, to the user (figure 8, col. 12 lines 1-28 [*client 840 requests and downloads e-mail messages from mail server 850 to client downloaded e-mail 865*);

(G) wherein the consolidated e-mail storage includes storage for e-mail associated with other users (figure 8, elements 875 or 896).

However, **Mendez** does not explicitly teach the feature of (D) the consolidated e-mail storage having at least two states, including a first state having at least one e-mail message which has been deleted from the external e-mail server; and a second state having no e-mail message which has been deleted from the external e-mail server; and (H) wherein the state is determined on the basis of compared message identifiers in the message identifier storage to message identifiers in e-mail received from the external e-mail server. **Brunson** teaches the consolidated e-mail storage having at least two states, including a first state having at least one e-mail message which has been deleted from the external e-mail server; and a second state having no e-mail message which has been deleted from the external e-mail server; and wherein the state is determined on the basis of compared message identifiers in the message identifier storage to message identifiers in e-mail received from the external e-mail server figure 5, blocks 418, 426, 430, and 432, col. 8, lines 1-41 [*determining if messages in e-mail mailbox 21 and 31 of e-mail server 20 and voice-mail server 30 has been deleted by comparing the message IDs stored in mailbox with message Ids in table 200, then processor 12 deletes the message's entry from the table 200 that stores in the memory of the synchronizer*). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the Data Processing art at the time of the invention to combine the teachings of **Mendez and Brunson** to have feature of comparing message identifier and deleting message in the system because it would have an efficient communication system that enable to exchange, synchronize and unify of e-mail messages between the various messaging system based upon comparing message identifier, thus enabling the users to retrieve e-

mail messages from a plurality of messaging systems through one of those messaging system (see Brunson col. 1, lines 7-45).

26. As to claim 23, **Mendez** does not explicitly teach the state is determined on the basis of compared message identifiers of e-mail on the external e-mail server to message identifiers in the message identifier storage. However, **Brunson** teaches the invention substantially as claimed, wherein the state is determined on the basis of compared message identifiers of e-mail on the external e-mail server to message identifiers in the message identifier storage (figure 3, col. 6 lines 52-col. 7, lines 9). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the Data Processing art at the time of the invention to combine the teachings of **Mendez and Brunson** to have the feature of comparing the message identifier because it would provide an efficient communication system that can exchange, synchronize and unify of e-mail messages between the various messaging system based on message identifier, thus enabling the users to retrieve e-mail messages from a plurality of messaging systems through one of those messaging system (see Brunson col. 1, lines 7-45).

27. Claims 12, 21 and 24 have similar limitation as claim 9; therefore, they are rejected under the same rationale.

Conclusion

28. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure:

a) Kunjibettu (US. Pat. No. 6,697,458) discloses a system and method for synchronizing various mailboxes.

b) Chandhok et al. (US. Pat. No. 6,662,212) discloses system and method for synchronizing files shared through e-mail.

c) Lincke et al. (US. Pat. No. 6,360,272) discloses system and method for synchronizing and unifying of multiple mailboxes.

d) Rigaldies et al. (US. Pat. No. 6,792,085) discloses system and method for unified messaging with message replication and synchronization.

e) Halim et al. (US. Pat. No. 6,304,881) discloses a method for remote data access and synchronization.

f) Kalley et al. (US. Pat. No. 6,601,088) discloses user controlled e-mail deletion.

29. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Thu Ha Nguyen, whose telephone number is (571) 272-3989. The examiner can normally be reached Monday through Friday from 8:30 AM to 5:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, SPE Hosain T. Alam, can be reached at (571) 272-3978.

Any inquiry of a general nature of relating to the status of this application should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-9600.

The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703-746-7240 for regular communications and 703-746-7238 for After Final communications.

Thu Ha Nguyen

January 24, 2005

HOSAIN ALAM
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER